DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 798 JC 760 192

AUTHOR Cohen, Arthur M.
TITLE New Degrees for Old Faculty?
PUB DATE 14 Nov 75
NOTE 17p.; Adapted from a speech to the New York State Education Department, Doctor of Arts Conference, (New York University, November 14, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Doctoral Degrees; *Doctoral Programs; *Junior Colleges; *Program Design

ABSTRACT

Based on a literature review and a recently-conducted nationwide survey of the community college humanities faculty, this paper reviews the demand for doctoral degrees and recommends ways of structuring doctoral programs for community college instructors. Since the demand for new community college faculty is dropping off, and since many persons already holding two-year college teaching positions desire further preparation, universities should design their doctoral programs for the latter group. Greater success will be enjoyed if the program allows its students to retain their positions by studying in their home area and at their own pace. It is also important that doctoral programs for community college instructors attempt to straddle disciplines wherever possible. It is further recommended that such programs: (1) offer classes, workshops, modules, and lectures on the community college campus itself, (2) involve community college faculty members as clinical professors, (3) appoint a program head to take responsibility for all aspects of the program, (4) provide a component to assist two-year college division and department chairpersons to be supervisors and coordinators of curriculum and instruction, and (5) provide courses for those faculty interested in professional upgrading but not in the degree. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119798

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

New Degrees for Old Faculty?

Arthur M. Cohen
University of California
Los Angeles

For decades the nation has looked to California for ideas in higher education, just as for decades it has looked to New York for ideas in finance. By 1975, although neither area was actually bankrupt, both were badly in need of overhaul.

The preparation of instructors for California two-year colleges offers a case in point. Junior college teacher preparation programs have been maintained in California universities since the 1950's. There are variations among them but most include course work, student teaching, and teaching internship components. All have some special focus; for example, the UCLA program features defined instructional outcomes, the use of measurable teaching objectives, and internships with minimal supervision. Students working on Masters Degrees in academic subject areas come to the Graduate School of Education for a course in the philosophy and operation of the community college and in the special techniques needed to teach in these institutions. They do internships in local community colleges, thus getting field practice. Having received this training they are eligible for a teaching credential and for employment. In brief, the program serves to qualify people with no teaching experience for full-time jobs in community

Adapted from a speech to the New York State Education Department Doctor of Arts Conference, New York University, November 14, 1975.

JC 760 192

colleges.

For many reasons these programs--although still on the books in most universities--are hardly functioning. First, the state modified the teaching certificate requirements so that course work in pedagogy and practice teaching was no longer required. Second, the programs oversupplied the market, continuing in high gear even while the demand for full-time teachers was rapidly diminishing. Third, the career route to full-time teaching shifted as the community colleges began employing people on part-time or hourly rates or as instructional aides; these became the entry points from which full-time faculty were selected. And fourth, the program directors tired of trying to persuade employing agents that a person with certain demonstrated skills might be a better instructor than one who had nothing more to show than several years of experience. The directors had become brokers between the academic departments in the universities--attempting to persuade them to modify their subject-area course offerings to make them more useful for prospective two-year college teachers--and the employing administrators in the community colleges--trying to convince them to give new people a chance.

The limbo status of preservice junior college teacher preparation in California looms large in the context of calls for new degrees and new patterns of preparing college faculty in other parts of the country. D.A., D.A.T., D.Phil.--who needs them? There is certainly no shortage of qualified instructors for academic programs anywhere.

And the demand for new faculty will be scant for a long time to come. Cartter predicts that fewer than 20,000 new instructors will be needed in two-year colleges nationwide for the entire decade, 1981-1990. This includes everyone necessary to replace people lost through death or retirement, and it accounts for new enrollments. Newly employed faculty members with doctorates, he says, will total between 2650 and 3960 of the 20,000--from 13-20% of new hires. Accordingly he points out that "...the 2-year college sector is not likely to represent a vast new untapped market for doctorates being trained by the nation's graduate schools. In the 1960's about 60,000 new junior faculty members were employed in 2-year colleges for degree-credit instruction; for the 1980's the projections suggest the figure will be closer to 20,000. Even if half of these new hires had the doctorate (a most unlikely occurrence given the views of 2-year college employers), this would probably represent a demand for only 5 percent of the expected doctoral output" (Cartter and Salter, 1975, p. 40).

Cartter's estimate that from 13-20% of new hires will hold the doctorate is certainly not low. According to the American Council on Education surveys of 1970 and 1972, newly employed faculty with doctorates numbered around 6% (Bayer, 1970, 1973). The total faculty in community colleges with doctoral degrees was less than 9% during those same years. In spring, 1975, a nationwide survey of Humanities faculty members, conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, found 14% of the full-timers with the doctorate (including Doctors of Divinity and Doctors of Jurisprudence). The Center staff predicts that from 20-22% of the full-time degree-credit instructors in community colleges will have the doctorate by 1980. But this does not mean that 20-22% of the newly employed faculty will have it; the figure includes those who will get the doctorate while they are on the job.

This last point deserves elaboration. The Center's study covered a carefully drawn sample of 2384 people teaching Humanities courses in a stratified sample of two-year colleges. The survey procedures have been described elsewhere (Cohen, 1975); suffice to say here that an 84% response to an eleven-page questionnaire structured to elicit faculty members' attitudes, opinions, values, aspirations, and much additional information was obtained. The 156 colleges in the sample were nearly exactly proportionate in terms of control, locale, size, age, emphasis, and organization.

The Center's findings on doctoral degree holders confirmed the widely held supposition that two-year college faculty members traditionally acquire a doctorate after years on the job. That is, they do not enter the institution holding the degree but get it later. More than one-third of the people with doctorates were age 51 or over whereas fewer than one-fourth of the total sample were in the older age group. In addition 19% of the people teaching Humanities have their highest degree in Education, suggesting that the person with a masters in a teaching discipline picks up a doctorate in Education along the way.

Further, the most likely reason that a much higher percent of instructors had the doctorate in 1975 than had it even five years earlier is not that more people with doctorates are being employed but that the growth in faculty has slowed considerably. Heretofore the number of faculty members who attained doctorates while they were on the job was offset by the influx of new people without higher degrees, thus maintaining a constant ratio of under 10% of the whole. Now that the percentage of new full-timers employed annually has dropped off considerably, the tendency of working faculty to obtain doctoral degrees has moved the percentage up. In the Center's sample, 24% of the faculty without doctorates said they were currently working toward one. If only one-fourth of them complete this degree in the next five years the 20-22%

prediction will hold.

Why do they want a degree? It sounds ignoble but two-year college faculty members may well be obtaining doctorates because of money primarily. Progression on the salary schedule in most two-year colleges is automatic with people receiving increments according to their years of experience and graduate credits earned. And the degree title isn't important--they will take any doctorate they can get if it moves them up on the salary schedule and brings a little prestige along with it.

Community college administrators frequently say that graduate education is inadequate for teachers in their institutions. They want teachers "committed to the open-door philosophy" and with "a genuine interest in students." They want a flexible faculty, instructors who will plan courses carefully. They want faculty who do not hold a strict allegiance to a single academic discipline but those who are able and willing to teach in two or three fields (McCabe and Smith, p. 13).

The faculty have different concerns. They often object to currently offered degrees because of residence requirements, admissions criteria, involved application processes, and lack of proximity to jobs. They want courses offered on nights and Saturdays so that they can obtain the degree with minimal effort while they maintain a full-time teaching job. Lest this sound like an overstatement, consider the figures for the NOVA University National Ed.D Program for Community Colleges. NOVA began its program in 1973 with the specific requirement that applicants have a job in a community college and be willing to work on the degree on occasional weekends during the year and for a few weeks during the summer. By 1975 the program had more than 800 two-year college practitioners enrolled. Is it because the program is so outstanding that the matriculants feel they will gain invaluable insight into their profession and unique skills not obtainable elsewhere? Or is it because

the program does not require residency--hence demands less commitment than most other programs--and offers a degree that can be cashed in for the same price at the salary counter?

The university that purports to train community college instructors must take these assertions into account. Very few jobs will be available for new faculty members in coming years. Very few people with doctorates are employed at entry-level jobs in two-year colleges. A great many two-year college faculty members obtain doctorates while they are on the job. And a program that allows them to do so while retaining their positions can be a roaring success if it makes provision for them to study in their home area at their own pace.

Proponents of Doctor of Arts programs for community college faculty should be especially wary. These programs must face not only the current poor market conditions but also the perception of the Doctor of Arts as a lesser degree. Jencks and Riesman spell out the problem: "A teaching doctorate would have less status and attract less talented students than one aimed at training scholars. Its graduates would have difficulty getting good jobs, even in colleges that claim not to be concerned with whether their faculty do research. This would scare away able students interested in teaching, simply because they would not want to settle for a degree that kept many academic doors closed to them" (1968, p. 535). Even though this statement may not be entirely valid, it does give voice to an opinion that is not unique in graduate institutions.

Several successful Doctor of Arts programs have been launched in recent years. The University of Michigan Doctor of Arts in English is one of the more widely known. Enrolling from 15 to 20 new students each year, its graduates invariably find teaching positions. But one of the requirements for admission to the program is that the applicant has been employed previously as a teacher, and indeed, most of the students in the program are on leave from faculty positions in secondary schools, community colleges, and undergraduate institutions.

In brief, a Doctor of Arts degree program for community college instructors should be developed only if it is tailored for commuters from full-time positions or for faculty members who can take leave from their jobs to do a year of residency. A graduate school may be able to recruit people from its undergraduate programs who do not yet have full-time teaching jobs but the biggest market--and perhaps the biggest need--is from among currently employed instructors. And members of this group will gravitate toward the program that makes the fewest demands on their time away from the job.

Data from the Center for the Study of Community Colleges survey of Humanities faculty members suggest a decided demand for further preparation. More than 85% of the respondents said they would like to take steps toward professional development in the next five years. When asked what type of training they would seek, about one-third said they would like to get a Ph.D or Ed.D. while another third said they would like to "enroll in courses in a university." Other choices received less favorable attention: get a Doctor of Arts Degree, 7%; get a Masters Degree, 8%; enroll in inservice courses at their own college, 9%. Nearly 20% said they would like to take steps toward professional development that did not include institutionally sponsored courses or programs.

Some other data from the survey are useful in planning programs for two-year college faculty. When asked, "If you had a free summer, what would you do with it? more than half the group said they would travel. One-third said they would take classes, study, or read.

TABLE 1 HERE

Other responses are noted in Table 1. (The figures add up to more than 100% because this was a free-response item and many people gave more than one answer).

The survey found nothing to suggest that the numbers of newly employed faculty with doctorates will change. Division and department chairpersons were asked whether or not there was pressure to hire or not to hire people with the doctorate and fewer than 5% indicated pressure each way. In response to an open-ended question asking why they would or would not hire doctoral degree holders, most chairpersons said, "We hire the best person regardless of the degree." Many felt that doctoral degree holders are "more capable", but about as many felt they were not desirable because they command high salaries or because the degree is unnecessary. Fewer than 2% felt that doctoral degree holders are too specialized to teach in community colleges. Still, 61% of the chairpersons said that in the future they planned to hire instructors who hold doctoral degrees. Table 2 presents responses of chairpersons who have had experience with instructors holding the doctorate.

TABLE 2 HERE

Even though most of the faculty indicate they would like to take steps toward professional development, most are satisfied with the training they have had. Table 3 shows their responses to a question as to the type of training they would seek before teaching if they were to begin all over again.

TABLE 3 HERE

And although they are quite satisfied with their current positions, a high percentage feel that a faculty position at a college or university would be very attractive. The data in Table 4 also tend to belie the frequently heard contention that faculty are interested in higher degrees so that they can move into administration. Two-year college faculty members seem to be interested in teaching, either at a two-year or four-year institution.

TABLE 4 HERE

The survey also found many faculty teaching in two or more subject areas, especially in the smaller institutions. It is a rare community college that can hire full-time staff to teach exclusively in such areas as Anthropology, Art History, Theatre Appreciation, Comparative Literature, and the many other fields that serve to make up a complete Humanities program. There is a market for the degree program or non-degree-related sequence that will assist instructors in making relationships among disciplines.

Community college faculty members themselves should be involved in planning and conducting training sessions at the graduate institutions. Respondents to the survey indicated that they looked to their colleagues as prime sources of advice on teaching. Their own students rank second and all others, including university professors, community college administrators, high school teachers, and professional association conferences, are far in the rear. They want to talk to their peers about their work; members of other groups are seen as outsiders.

In sum, the graduate institution that would build a new program--or modify an existing program--to better serve two-year college instructors should attend to the following suggestions:

Construct the program to serve commuters. Design it for faculty who are full-time or part-time employees in community college districts now and who want a higher degree to learn more about their subject field, gain prestige within their institution, move higher on the salary schedule, or for their own sense of accomplishment. There will be few new full-time jobs available; hence, a program for students fresh from undergraduate school is attracting the wrong group. And short of natural attrition,

there is literally no chance for new people--no matter how well they are qualified--to replace faculty currently teaching in the colleges. The route to full-time employment is through part-time teaching. This will not change in the near future. To be successful, a program must be available to people who cannot come to the campus for extended periods of time.

Straddle departments where feasible. Offer a degree in Social Science, Humanities, or Life Sciences, rather than in Psychology, Theatre History, or Microbiology. The number of interdisciplinary courses in community colleges is increasing and, even now, many faculty teach in multiple subject areas. Many employing administrators tend to shun applicants with a strong affinity for a single academic discipline. Few community college faculty members read journals in their disciplines; they have little opportunity to stay abreast of developments in their field. A degree program that assists them in making interrelationships among disciplines is well suited for them.

Offer classes, workshops, modules, lectures on the community college campus itself. The faculty want and will subscribe overwhelmingly to a program that provides courses on their campus. Travelling to a university is seen as unnecessary and undesirable. Any mode of information transmission offered on site is preferred.

Involve community college faculty members as clinical professors. They can set up the on-site workshops. The faculty like associating with their peers. They look forward to hearing from people teaching in their area who come from other colleges.

Appoint a program head who will take responsibility for all aspects of the program. This must be someone who sees his/her role as recruiting students to the program, selecting courses within the university that fit the program, setting up new courses and on-site workshops, and counseling students. The program cannot be managed by a person who sees it as a subordinate responsibility.

Include a teacher of teachers component. Let the program assist two-year college division and department chairpersons to be supervisors and coordinators of curriculum and instruction. This allows for a leverage effect, getting the university more influence in the institution than it can obtain merely by training a few people a year within the various colleges.

Let the program serve functions other than to award degrees. Even though it should rest on a coherent curriculum, the program need not be limited to degree service. The workshops, special courses, and interinstitutional relationships established can be used as modules for upgrading faculty already holding the doctorate. The same incentives for enrollment are not there, but short courses on site will attract a few of the professionally commited.

Above all, do not take the position, "Well, since many of our doctoral graduates cannot get first-choice positions in four-year colleges or universities I suppose they will be going to community colleges. Therefore, we ought to modify our offerings a bit and teach them something about working in a two-year institution That kind of thinking leads to both pedagogical and fiscal dilemmas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bayer, Alan E. College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

_____. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

Cartter, Allen M., and Salter, Maurice M. "Two-Year College Faculty and Enrollment Projections." In S. V. Martorana, and Others (Eds.) Graduate Education and the Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development. Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education. Technical Report 5, August 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M. Maximizing Responses to a Nationwide Faculty Survey. Presented to California Educational Research Association annual conference. San Diego, November 12, 1975.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

McCabe, Robert, and Smith, Cynthia M. "New Programs and Practices and Desirable Faculty Competencies and Attitudes." In S. V. Martorana, and Others (Eds.) Graduate Education and the Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development. Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education. Technical Report 5, August 1975.

TABLE 1

IF YOU HAD A FREE SUMMER, WHAT WOULD YOU DO WITH IT?

Travel	52.8%
Take classes/read/study	33.3
Recreation/rest	17.4
Write for publication	14.1
Do research	8.7
Work on advanced degree	8.2
Create/perform/paint	7.6
Work as teacher/prepare classes	6.5
Attend professional workshops	1.7
Work at trade	1.3
All other	.2
N/A	3.9

TABLE 2

WHAT HAS BEEN YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH INSTRUCTORS HOLDING A DOCTORATE?

They are fine teachers	24.2%
Their performance is the same as others	22.0
I have no experience	15.1
They are good leaders/have high professional qualities	10.3
They have good personal qualities	2.2
They do not know how to teach	6.7
They are unable to relate to students	6.7
A negative experience--they are too high thinking	4.9
They are too ambitious	1.3
All others	.9
N/A	19.7

TABLE 3

WHAT TYPE OF TRAINING WOULD YOU SEEK BEFORE TEACHING IF YOU WERE TO BEGIN ALL OVER AGAIN?

Do the same	33.2%
Study Humanities	11.6
Do more student teaching	9.2
Take more teaching methods courses	9.1
Get higher degree	5.8
Take more psychology/ developmental courses	5.6
Acquire business/technical skills	4.6
Study social science	3.3
Go to law or med. school	3.0
Take fewer education courses	2.4
Less emphasis on specialized training	2.3
Study math or science	1.9
Prepare for community college	1.1
Not teach	1.1
Go to a different college	1.0
Would not get higher degree	.1
All others	4.8
No answer	11.5

TABLE 4

FIVE YEARS FROM NOW YOU MAY BE CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING POSITIONS. HOW ATTRACTIVE DO THEY APPEAR TO YOU RIGHT NOW?

FACULTY POSITION AT A 4-YEAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	
very attractive	39.0%
somewhat attractive	36.2
unattractive	18.8
N/A	6.0
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION IN COMMUNITY OR JUNIOR COLLEGE	
very attractive	13.7
somewhat attractive	24.4
unattractive	55.2
N/A	6.7
DOING WHAT I'M DOING NOW	
very attractive	37.9
somewhat attractive	40.2
unattractive	14.4
N/A	7.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 16 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES